

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/940,787	08/29/2001	Satoshi Suzuki	010966	4600	
25050	7590 06/25/2003	IIATTODI IID	EXAMINER		
ARMSTRONG,WESTERMAN & HATTORI, LLP 1725 K STREET, NW					
SUITE 1000			SERGENT, RABON A		
WASHINGTO	ON, DC 20006		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1711	10	
			DATE MAILED: 06/25/2003	3	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	4
Advisory Action	09/940,787	SUZUKI ET AL.	- /
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Rabon Sergent	1711	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED 27 May 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THI Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average in a rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this application at the control of the control	ation. A proper reply h places the applica	y to a ition in
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The ee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of the under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the content o	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply the later than three months after the mail	g date of the final rejecting FINAL REJECTION. R 1.136(a) and the approper of the fee. The appropriation of the fee. The final the fina	on. See MPEP opriate extension opriate extension Office action; or
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o		
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be			
(a) Method they raise new issues that would require further	·	see NOTE below);	
(b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	•		
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sir	nplifying the
(d) they present additional claims without cancell	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claim	S.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	eparate, timely filed	amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: Sec		dered but does NO	T place the
 The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were	e newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:			
Claim(s) allowed: <u>0</u> . Claim(s) objected to: <u>0</u> . Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-17</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: <u>0</u> .			
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Exami	ner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer		•	
10. ☐ Other:	((o)(1101110)1 apol ((o))	·	
		Rabon Sergent Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1711	

Continuation Sheet (PTO-303)

Continuation of 2. The proposed range limitation raises the issue of lack of support within the specification and would require further consideration and /or search since the proposed range has not previously been claimed.

Continuation of 5. The response is based largely on an amendment that will not be entered for the reasons set forth within paragraph 2. As a result, the rejections have been maintained for the reasons set forth within the final Office action.